

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Ecology and Environment
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGEE_12704
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessments of soil quality and soil erosion hazards in Arjasa Agricultural Sub Watershed, Indonesia
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript makes a significant contribution to understanding soil quality dynamics and erosion risks in tropical agricultural areas, particularly in the Arjasa sub-watershed in Indonesia. The study provides valuable data on factors influencing soil degradation, a major issue for the sustainable management of agricultural and water resources in this region.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	a repetition of the word sol in the title and I prefer the following title:Assessment of soil quality and erosion risk in Arjasa agricultural Sub Watershed, Indonesia	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Very long abstract shows only a repetition of the methodology used. In the abstract generally we present a general vision of the problem studied plus the result that we have obtained the solutions in twenty lines no more	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	the manuscript lacks originality one more detail for the introduction and the analysis of the result can matter the originality of the work	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are older. Please enter current references.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Boubaker Khallef
Department, University & Country	Institute of Architecture and Earth Sciences, University Abbas Ferhat, Algeria